

Patent
Attorney's Docket No. 004968-005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of) <u>DISCUSSION DRAFT -- DO NOT</u>
David R. FERGUSON et al.) <u>ENTER AS A FORMAL PAPER</u>
)
Application No.: 08/947,435) Group Art Unit: 2771
)
Filed: October 8, 1997) Examiner: E. Colbert
)
For: COMPUTER-BASED DOCUMENT)
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM)

PROPOSED INTERVIEW AGENDA

Time: Wednesday, August 30, 2000 at 3:00 PM.

Status of Application:

The present office action is a non-final action in response to Applicants' Appeal Brief. Claims 1-28, 30-51 and 53-83 are pending, wherein claims 1-28, 30-46 and 51 are rejected, and claims 47-50 and 53-83 contain allowable subject matter.

Topics for Discussion:

1. First, we would like to discuss the intended meaning of certain important claim language, particularly, the phrases "predefined behavior" and "category criteria", which appears to be the basis for some confusion.
2. We would like to discuss the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 51, more particularly, whether these claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) or 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Applicants are confused inasmuch as the discussion in paragraph 6 of the Office Action appears to indicate that claims 1 and 2 are rejected under "Section 103 of Title 35 of the United States Code"; however, paragraph 9 of the Office Action clearly recites that claims 1, 2 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Application Serial No. 08/947,435
Attorney's Docket No. 004968-005

3. We would like to discuss independent claims 1 and 51, more particularly, the meaning of certain claim features and the meaning of certain passages in Zarmer et al. which have been cited against these features.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: Penny Caudle

Penny L. Caudle

Registration No. P-46,607

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: August 28, 2000